



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

80

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,146	09/06/2000	William F. Beausoleil	POU9-1999-0183-US1	9242

34313 7590 06/27/2005

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT
4 PARK PLAZA
SUITE 1600
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558

EXAMINER

CRAIG, DWIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,146

Applicant(s)

BEAUSOLEIL ET AL.

Examiner

Dwin M Craig

Art Unit

2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 5-9 have been presented for reconsideration in view of Applicant's amended claims language, arguments and Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR § 1.114. Claims 1-4 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants' arguments see pages 5 and 6, filed 4-11-2005 with respect to the 35 USC § 102(b) rejections using Applicant's submitted drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 102(b) rejections of Claims 5-9 have been withdrawn. More specifically, Applicants' arguments in regards to the drawing being prior art references have been persuasive in that these drawings not made public at least a year before the filing date of Applicants' instant application.

2.1 As regards Applicants' arguments concerning the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejections of Claims 5-9 using the *Staros* 5,708,850 US Patent reference.

The Examiner has found the argument persuasive more specifically the Examiner agrees with Applicant that, "*Staros does not disclose or suggest the use of clusters of processors for executing logic gate functions from a logic design and, in conjunction with Time Division Multiplexers, for verifying a Functionality of the logic design in accordance with amended claims 5-9*". (See Applicant's 4-11-05 responses page 6.)

The Examiner has found this argument to be persuasive in that the cited reference does not suggest the use of clusters. Therefore the earlier prior art rejection is withdrawn.

2.2 An updated search, based on Applicants' arguments and amended claim language has yielded new art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. **Claims 5, 7 and 9** are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by **Lin et al. U.S. Patent 6,026,230**.

3.1 *Lin et al.* teaches the use of clusters of processors (**Figure 8, Figure 22 item 701, Figure 24, Figure 39, Figures 40a and 40b, Figure 45 items 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, Col. 33 lines 24-36**) for executing logic gate functions from a logic design (**Figure 29 Item 807, Abstract**) and, in conjunction with Time Division Multiplexers, (**Figure 14, Col. 45 lines 54-67 and all of Col. 46**) for verifying a Functionality of the logic design (**Col. 1 lines 10-16 "Field of the Invention"**).

3.2 The *Lin et al.* reference also teaches *a data memory having a set of read ports (Figure 60), a time-division multiplexer associated with each of said clusters (Figure 14) coupling a said set of read ports of said data memory (Figure 56 and 57 and Col. 93 lines 63-67 and Col. 94 lines 1-29) to a said set of read addresses of one processor of said cluster during one read cycle of said memory (Figures 61-63).*

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4.1 The following is an Examiner's reasons for allowance.

The prior art does not expressly disclose or make obvious the following limitation in combination with other limitations, *"The software driven emulation engine wherein said memory has an operating clock rate for read operations that is twice an operating clock rate of said processors"*.

Drawings

5. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because The current drawings are informal. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Conclusion

6. Claims 5-9 have been presented for reconsideration based on Applicants amended claim language, arguments and Request for Continued Examination. Claims 5, 7 and 9 are rejected under new grounds of rejection. Claims 6 and 8 are objected to.

6.1 The Office Action is **Non-Final**.


Art Unit: 2123

6.2 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dwain M Craig whose telephone number is (571) 272-3710. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo P Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMC


W. Thompson
Primary Examiner
TC 2100
AU 2123